

340.91  
G317p  
no. 14, cop. 3

LIBRARY  
OF THE  
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

# BY · THEIR · WORKS · YE SHALL · KNOW · THEM

BY · ALFRED · HOYT · GRANGER ★  
PUBLISHED · UNDER · THE · AUS-  
PICES · OF · THE · GERMANISTIC ·  
SOCIETY · OF · CHICAGO ★ · · · · ·

# FOREWORD

The Germanistic Society plans to issue a series of pamphlets to appear from time to time, dealing with the war in Europe and its underlying causes. The pamphlets are to serve the cause of truth, to correct misrepresentations, and to exemplify the spirit of objectivity and fair play.

## Former publications:

- No. 1—Germany and the Peace of Europe  
By Prof. Ferdinand Schevill.
- No. 2—The Causes of the European Conflict  
By Prof. John W. Burgess.
- No. 3—How Germany Was Forced Into War  
By Raymond E. Swing.
- No. 4—The Session of the German Reichstag  
By Prof. Alex. R. Hohlfeld.
- No. 5—Germany's Fateful Hour  
By Prof. Kuno Francke.
- No. 6—German "Atrocities" and International Law  
By Prof. James G. McDonald.
- No. 7—"Militarism" and "The Emperor," the latter  
By Prof. John W. Burgess.
- No. 8—The Evolution of the German Empire  
By Prof. Geo. L. Scherger.
- No. 9—German Resources and the War  
By Dr. Bernhard Dernburg.
- No. 10—Germany and England, the Real Issue  
By Dr. Bernhard Dernburg.
- No. 11—Russian Diplomacy and the War  
By Prof. James W. Thompson.
- No. 12—German "War Makers"  
By Noel Sargent.
- No. 13—Nationalism in Europe  
By Prof. Dr. Franz Boas.

Copies of these pamphlets are for sale at the office of the Society at the following prices:

Single copies.....	\$ 0.05
10 copies.....	0.25
100 copies.....	1.50
1000 copies (f. o. b. Chicago)	10.00

Profits, if any, will be turned over to the Society of the Red Cross.

THE GERMANISTIC SOCIETY  
OF CHICAGO . . . . .  
Louis Guenzel, Recording Secretary  
332 So. Michigan Ave., Chicago, Ill.

# “By their works ye shall know them.”

## A Plea for Justice.

By

ALFRED HOYT GRANGER

William of Hohenzollern, by grace of God, King of Prussia, German Emperor; George, by grace of God, King of Great Britain and Ireland, Emperor of India; these are the official titles of the two most conspicuous rulers in Europe today, and today, for the first time in their history, the two nations which these rulers represent are in a life and death struggle with each other, a struggle so vast and so horrible that the rest of the world looks on aghast. For the past six months the causes for this struggle have been the one paramount subject of discussion in these United States and this discussion has become so acrimonious that the noble letter of our President to the American people, urging upon us not only the wisdom but also the necessity of our reserving judgment until the war is over and peace once more assured, seems to have been forgotten. If one were today to ask the average American his opinion of the first of the two titles quoted above, he would describe it as “absurd, arrogant, blasphemous.” Should you quote him the second, he would dismiss it with a wave of the hand saying, “that means nothing.” Before attempting to point out only a few of the facts about William II, in order that by his works he may be understood and judged by the American people, let us consider for a moment what those titles to sovereignty really mean. That the Kaiser considers himself appointed by God to rule over the German people is a fact that no one who has followed his career or read his speeches can for a moment doubt. As far back as March, 1890, when he was but thirty-one years of age and had been on the throne not quite two years, he said to the men at Brandenburg:

“I look upon the people and nation handed on to me as a responsibility conferred upon me by God, and that it is, as is written in the Bible, my duty to increase this heritage for which one day I shall be called upon to give an account.”

Later in the same year he said:

“It is a tradition of our House that we, the Hohenzollerns, regard ourselves as appointed by God to govern and to lead the people whom it is given us to rule for their well being and the advancement of their material and intellectual interests.”

That both of these speeches were prompted by sincere and earnest conviction no man can doubt—and why should he?

If we look back over the whole history of the human race, has not every man whose name is revered and honored because of his achievements considered himself specially called by God to do his special work in the world? David, in Holy Writ, constantly spoke

of himself as chosen by God to rule His chosen people. We have but to look at the lives of the two greatest leaders of our own nation, Washington and Lincoln, to realize their belief that it was a Divine Father who was leading and guiding them in the paths which lead to greatness. Not only in the realm of statesmanship do we find men living and working "by grace of God," but in every walk of life those who accomplish the greatest things feel and acknowledge a Divine Power and Inspiration pushing them on. In judging William II's claim to Divine Right we must remember his ancestry, his education and environment and above all the belief in and acquiescence to such claim by a great, virile and intensely intellectual people. In England the King is ruler "by grace of God" in much the same sense as were Washington and Lincoln and is today, Woodrow Wilson.

The Anglo-Saxon, from the days of King John, has fought for what he deemed his rights and has won them by God's grace, and guided by that same grace he has chosen his own ruler. The German people on the other hand have, until the end of the Franco-Prussian War, cared little for political liberty. Every real liberty which they now enjoy has been almost forced upon them from the crown, not because the people demanded it, but because the Sovereign deemed it for the betterment of his people.

Through the long centuries from the death of Charlemagne until the final disruption of the Holy Roman Empire in 1806, the history of the German people is submerged in accounts of struggles between petty princes for what each one regarded as his hereditary rights. Not until after the third French Revolution in 1848 did the question of uniting all of these kingdoms and principalities under one strong central government become a paramount issue and not until the war with France in 1870 in which Germany came out victor was such an unification really possible. After the establishment of the present German Empire in 1871, the Crown led the way in all matters of political and social reform—not because the people demanded these reforms, but because the sovereign deemed them necessary for the highest development of the nation. In judging the German civilization this fact should never be lost sight of. During the reign of Wilhelm I and his son, some social reforms were begun but, owing to the vast problem of organizing and unifying the whole body politic, social matters of necessity occupied a second place in the minds of the rulers. It was not until William II came to the throne in 1888 that social reforms became vital questions and it is almost wholly due to his influence that they have been carried to their present high state of perfection and Germany made the most truly socialized country in the world. When William II became Emperor, all Europe was filled with stories of what he would be and do, and most of these stories dealt only with rumors of what he would make out of the Prussian Army. That he should develop the army to the highest point of efficiency was to be expected of any man brought up by William I, Frederick and Bismarck, but the young Emperor soon began to show Europe that he had other ideals than those of merely military greatness. In 1888, the German nation was made up of practically three groups: the agriculturists, the students



(including writers, musicians, and artists), and the army. There were no large cities, in the present acceptation of the word, and no prosperous manufacturing centres.

Thirty years ago a chimney in a German town was an unusual sight, and today there are almost as many thriving manufacturing towns as there were then chimnies. Leipzig, Pforzheim, Chemnitz, Elberfeld, Riesa, Kiel and Essen, cities which until the outbreak of the present war were teeming with life and activity, with armies of laborers and millions of production, were at the commencement of the Kaiser's reign small provincial towns. William II quickly saw that if Germany was to become a really great power manufactures must be developed, transportation facilities increased, and education fostered and expanded beyond the old German ideals of scientific research. To do this, certain things were absolutely necessary. Manufacturers can not flourish to any great extent without a foreign commerce, foreign commerce demands an efficient merchant marine, but a merchant marine must be protected, hence the need of a navy. When he became Emperor, while Germany possessed a very moderate merchant marine, her fleet amounted to practically nothing. Bismarck had said in 1884 that Germany would never have any use for a navy. Almost from the beginning the Kaiser urged its necessity, but the Reichstag was niggardly and would vote no large appropriations. In 1899 he appointed Admiral von Tirpitz as Minister of Marine, and under his able administration, in spite of parliamentary opposition, the German Navy is now second only to that of Great Britain. It is much the same story with the Merchant Marine. At the formation of the Empire in 1871, Germany's Merchant Marine had a net tonnage of 982,355, of which over sixty per cent were sailing vessels, and in 1906 its tonnage amounted to 2,371,311. The building of this splendid service is almost wholly due to the energy and perseverance and financial generosity of the Kaiser. Industry, commerce, and shipping owe much to his unfailing interest and support, there is not an industry which he has not carefully fostered. He regularly visits prominent works throughout his dominions and he is personally familiar with every ship-building yard on his coasts. In his earnest endeavor to build up his people and thus fulfill the responsibility which he believes has been placed upon him by God, the Kaiser has shown an energy and a versatility that is almost superhuman, and this versatility has been the subject of the most adverse criticism against him, especially in England and America. We can readily understand such an attitude from the English press in spite of Carlyle's saying: "I confess, I have no notion of a truly great man that could not be all sorts of men," but such criticism from the land that has produced Washington and Lincoln, than whom no men could be more versatile, is certainly out of character. Not only has he fostered the commercial and material development of his country, but has also taken an active part in all educational and artistic matters. To the schools his watchword has been efficiency, to his mind education means to fit a man for life and above all for that walk of life which each student intends to follow. He visits the schools and gymnasia and universities frequently, and he always speaks to the students urging them to think of what their country will

need of them when they are men; to abstain from the use of alcohol; to make both the minds and bodies strong and efficient by hard work and hard play. He says to the University students not to waste their strength in cosmopolitan dreams or in one-sided party service, but to exert it to make stable the national idea and to foster the noblest German thoughts. He tells his own sons to work without ceasing to make themselves true men, to take Jesus as their guide, the most personal of all personalities. It is thus he speaks to the younger men, the hope of the nation, urging and again urging efficiency for the actual need. On the other hand, no one is more keenly alive to the power and influence of German thought and study aside from the rush of every-day life so, speaking to the professors in the University of Berlin, he lays emphasis on the "need of institutions that transcend the limits of a university and serve nothing but research, free from the demands made by instruction, although in close touch with the university."

Speaking to an assemblage of artists he has said:

"Art should be a help and an educational force for all classes of our people, giving them the chance when they are tired after hard labor of growing strong by the contemplation of ideal things. Attention to ideals is one of the greatest tests of culture and all our people must work at it if we are to set a good example to other nations, for culture, in order to do its task well, must permeate every stratum of society. But it can not do this if art refuses its help and pushes people into the gutter instead of elevating them."

The Kaiser has also been insistent upon what we, in this country, would consider socialistic legislation, by that I mean legislation for the betterment of the living conditions of the working men. The actual cause of his final break with Bismarck was the great Chancellor's refusal to approve the Emperor's policy as regards legislation for and treatment of the laboring classes. Bismarck, trained under the old regime and regarding military power and successful diplomacy as the only essential to the strength of a great nation, had naturally no sympathy with what he considered socialistic dreams. In February, 1890, the Kaiser wrote to Bismarck:

"It is the duty of the state to regulate the duration and conditions of work in such a manner that the health and the morality of the working man may be preserved and that his needs may be satisfied and his desire for equality before the law assured."

It was in 1889 and 1890 that the laws for old age, accident and sickness insurance were passed by the Reichstag under the direct urgency of the Emperor, and since then, many laws of a kindred character have been put through so that, today in Germany, it is possible for every citizen to receive a sound and thorough education fitting him for the greatest possible efficiency in the work he undertakes. With the fear of poverty removed from his old age, the working man is able to put himself wholly into his work, and he is always assured work through the vast system of government labor exchanges. In the cities all public utilities are owned and operated

by the municipalities, who also build cheap well-equipped working men's houses. That the Social Democratic Party realizes how nearly the present government conforms to its ideal of Social Democracy, was shown at the outbreak of the war when almost to a man that party supported the government. The differences between that party and the government are largely sentimental and in times of peace sentimental differences are often as acute as feuds in families. That the German Empire today is like a huge family has been shown by the enthusiasm and intensity with which all its members are supporting the Kaiser in the war.

No one can understand the German Emperor without realizing that he is a man of a strongly religious mind. In almost all of his speeches to his own people, he lays stress upon moral questions and constantly holds up the character of Jesus Christ as the ideal to which every man should strive. He continually tells his soldiers that the types of men he wants in his army and navy are Christian men, men who believe in and try to follow Jesus Christ. One result of the material prosperity that has come to the German people during the Kaiser's reign is to him a continual source of anxiety, and that is the increase of luxury in German life in the larger cities. He never misses an opportunity to urge the people to live modestly and simply, well within their means and without ostentation. All of his efforts along the lines upon which I have touched do not look like the work of a man who is war mad. On the contrary, I affirm that the Kaiser has been for twenty-five years the hardest worker in Europe in the cause of peace, and it is an indisputable fact that Germany is the only great power which has not had some sort of a war during that period. Many times he has held out against war at the risk of his own popularity among his own people, and frequently has he been accused of being Pro-English when some of the assumptions of the British Government have unduly excited the animosity of the German people. On October 28, 1908, the London Daily Telegraph published an interview with the Emperor which aroused a good deal of feeling in both England and Germany, and was largely quoted and commented upon by the American press. This interview is so simple, so straight-forward and so manly that I quote part of it as, to my mind, a sufficient proof of his real friendliness towards England:

"You English," said he, "are mad, mad as March hares. What has come over you that you are so completely given over to suspicions quite unworthy of a great nation? What more can I do than I have done? I declared, with all the emphasis at my command, in my speech at the Guild Hall, that my heart was set upon peace and that it is one of my dearest wishes to live on the best of terms with England. Have I ever been false to my word? Falseness and prevarication are alien to my nature. My actions ought to speak for themselves, but you listen not to them but to those who misinterpret and distort them. That is a personal insult which I feel and resent. To be forever misjudged, to have my repeated offers of friendship weighed and scrutinized with jealous, mistrustful eyes taxes my patience severely. I have said time after time that I am a friend of Eng-



land, and your Press—or at least a considerable section of it—bids the people of England refuse my proffered hand and insinuates that the other holds a dagger. How can I convince a nation against its will? I repeat that I am the friend of England, but you make things difficult for me. My task is not of the easiest. The prevailing sentiment among the large sections of the middle and lower classes of my own people is not friendly to England. I am, therefore, so to speak, in a minority in my own land, but it is a minority of the best elements, just as it is in England with respect to Germany. That is another reason why I resent your refusal to accept my pledged word that I am the friend of England. I strive, without ceasing, to improve relations and you retort that I am your arch-enemy. You make it very hard for me. Why is it?"

Referring to the Boer War and the Kruger telegram, which it has been definitely proven, even to the satisfaction of England, that His Majesty did not write, he said:

"I have referred to speeches in which I have done all that a sovereign can to proclaim my good will but, as actions speak louder than words, let me also refer to my acts. It is commonly believed in England that throughout the South African War Germany was hostile to her. German opinion undoubtedly was hostile—bitterly hostile. But what of official Germany? Let my critics ask themselves what brought to a sudden stop, and indeed to an absolute collapse, the European tour of the Boer delegates who were striving to obtain European intervention? They were feted in Holland, France gave them a rapturous welcome. They wished to come to Berlin where the German people would have crowned them with flowers; but—when they asked me to receive them I refused. The agitation immediately died away and the delegation returned empty-handed. Was that, I ask, the action of a secret enemy?"

I have quoted a part of this interview because it has a bearing upon a question which has been so frequently asked me since last July:

"Admitting all that you have said to be true and acknowledging all that the Kaiser has done in the past twenty-five years, why, if he is so powerful and so great, did he not prevent this awful war?"

From all the documents published on all sides of the question there is but one answer—that he could not prevent it. Professor Albert Bushnell Hart of Harvard, who probably has as wide a knowledge of European history and politics as any one in America who has thus far written about the war, says in the September number of the "World's Work," that this war has been practically inevitable since Metternich, at the close of the Napoleonic wars, arbitrarily divided up the map of Europe without regard to racial affiliations and that to hold any one man today directly responsible for the war is an act of great injustice. So much has been written and said about the various correspondences between the different sovereigns of Europe during those last days of July and the final out-



break that I do not intend to go into them in detail, but I think history will show that if any one nation precipitated this horrible world conflagration, most of the blame must be laid upon Russia. Apropos of the correspondence between the Czar and the Kaiser I do, however, wish to make some quotations from an article by Signor Cabasino-Renda, a well-known Italian writer, which he contributed to the *Giornale d' Italia* and which also appeared in the *Minerva Magazine*, which renders to the Italian people a similar service as our Review of Reviews. In this article he acquits the Czar of direct responsibility while blaming the Russian government. He says:

“From the day of the proclamation of war Germany was isolated in the world; telephonic communications were prohibited, telegrams reduced to the minimum and the postal service so retarded by the circulation of military trains as to become of next to no importance. Thus the notices from Berlin have become very infrequent in the Italian papers while those from Paris and London abound and diffuse themselves over entire pages.

“Are not then France and England in a state of war as well as Germany? Thus public opinion in Italy has been deceived as to the origin of this savage conflagration, and the conviction has been diffused that Germany longed for this war and that Russia, France and England were drawn into it in spite of themselves. The truth is just the contrary and this is shown quite clearly in the collection of diplomatic documents called the ‘White Book.’ An examination of these documents proves that the war was decided by Russia and that the German aggression against Russia is a legend that found credence for a few days, but is henceforth documentarily disproven.

“The double game of Russia appears from the fact, incredible as it may seem, that the Czar at two o'clock on the afternoon of July 31st was still telegraphing Emperor William: ‘I hope for the success of your mediation at Vienna for the good of our people and for the peace of all Europe,’ while in fact, on the morning of that day, the mobilization of troops against Germany had already begun. The order for mobilization had therefore been transmitted on the same night, perhaps at the very hour in which the German government was urging Vienna to accept Lord Grey’s proposition, already accepted in Petrograd, by which Austria would have been pledged to enter into negotiations while the occupation of Belgrade had hardly begun. And the pressure of Germany upon the government in Vienna was so strong that Vienna could not have refused to accept. In short, on the first of August there would have been a pacific solution of the crisis or at least the first and most important step towards such a solution, which would then have met the two conditions made by Russia—no territorial conquest by Austria-Hungary in Serbia and the abandonment of the interference by Austrian functionaries in the internal affairs of Serbia.

“A peaceful solution of the crisis then was about to be found upon this historic night. At midnight, however, without dally-

ing further with negotiations initiated at her desire, Russia ordered her mobilization and it was war!

“Did the Czar wish it? One may, perhaps, doubt it and believe instead that the military element which surrounded him and which wished for war at any price had called his hand and had precipitated the events by ordering a general mobilization precisely because it saw that the crisis was headed towards a peaceful solution.

“Various indications corroborate such suppositions: the fact that the Czar, at two o'clock in the afternoon of the 31st, sent to the Kaiser the above-mentioned telegram still expressing hope for the success of his efforts as mediator while already the Russian mobilization was by many hours on its way, perhaps without his knowing it; and again that phrase of the Czar's in his dispatch to the Kaiser of July 29th, which seems like the cry of his own impotence against the war makers of Petrograd, ‘I foresee that soon I shall no longer be able to resist the pressure that is being exercised upon me, and that I shall be constrained to yield to arrangements that will bring about war.’

Signor Cabasino-Renda then goes into an analysis of the motives of England and says:

“England, so she says, in defending the neutrality of Belgium, guards the rights of nations. But when and where has the United Kingdom shown herself so tender of the rights of nations? Was it when she attacked Copenhagen in times of peace and destroyed the Danish Fleet? Or was it when she destroyed the independence of the Boers? Here it may be speedily understood that she was so concerned as to the integrity of Belgium because it constituted an impediment to the German victory—or perhaps she would have reserved for France the rights of violation!

“The German government wished to confound this oblique and astute plan, preferring an immediate rupture which, at least, gave her the advantage of smoothing for herself the path across Belgium to victory.

“Thus henceforth the fight is in the open, the game unveiled.

“And it must be recognized that the Austro-Servian affair, the assassination of Franz Ferdinand, has as much connection with this war as had the candidacy of a Hohenzollern prince to the Spanish Crown with the war of 1870-71. The defense of violated Belgium on the part of England, the protection of the Serbs on the part of Russia, are motives which lack all impelling force.

“If Servia and Belgium had never existed the three-fronted attack would have come just the same, either now or next year or the year after that.

“The truth is that the war is against Germany and against Germany alone, from all sides and by every means. Too many German ships plough the sea, too much has her commerce developed, too much does she invade the markets of the world,

to boldly has she dared to create for herself a Colonial Empire. These things irritated and damaged England and preoccupied Russia. When Germany became strong, the Pan-Slavists thought that it would be necessary for their existence to destroy her. Bismarck already felt this and sought to retard the struggle as long as possible, but he never doubted that it would one day have to be fought out.

“Thus commercial rivalry with England, the hatred of the Russian race, the French thirst for revenge—these three diverse passions have been fused into an alliance. There has been ranged around Germany a conspiracy of hostile forces, just as there was formerly around Frederick the Great hostile forces which would have reduced him again to the little Margrave of Brandenburg, but the great King knew how to defend his own country. He did not stop for dangers, he did not count his enemies, and he broke the iron ring which bound him so tightly. The same forces were tried against little Prussia that are now being tried against great Germany.”

This last statement of Signor Cabasino-Renda's is true except in one particular. When continental Europe was united against Frederick, England was his friend. To many thinking men the greatest danger to civilization and the prospect of an enduring peace after this war is over lies in the fact that today England is allied with Russia and Russia never was and never can be, at bottom, other than England's most bitter opponent. From what we read in the English papers and reviews, it is evident that the British public is becoming alive to the dangers in this alliance. While the ante-bellum negotiations were in progress there was a strong sentiment, even in the cabinet, against Britain's entering into the war. When Mr. Asquith made his brilliant and stirring speech in favor of war, he so appealed to the British patriotism that for the moment all opposition was quelled and war was speedily declared, and—three cabinet ministers resigned! Had he put before the House of Commons all of the diplomatic correspondence as detailed in the White Papers and shown how, in spite of every effort made by the Kaiser, Lord Grey had refused to give to the German government any guarantee or hope of British neutrality, one can not but feel that the results might have been different. In both the British and German White Papers one reads that Germany agreed not to attack the northern coast of France, not to molest French maritime commerce, and to indemnify Belgium after the war for all damage resulting from a passage of their troops through that country and to safeguard its sovereignty and integrity. To all of these proposals Lord Grey turned a deaf ear. Under such circumstances what could Germany do? I quote the London Daily Graphic for a description of the continental situation while the above-mentioned correspondence between the British and German governments was going on:

“A general mobilization has been ordered in Russia and Germany has responded by proclaiming martial law throughout the Empire. We are now enabled to measure exactly the narrow and slippery ledge which still stands between Europe and the

Abyss of Armageddon. Will the Russian order be acted upon in the provinces adjoining the German Frontier? If it is, then the work of the peace-makers is at an end for Germany is bound to reply with a mobilization of her own armed forces, and a rush to the frontiers on all sides must ensue. We confess we are unable to understand the action of Russia in view of the resumption of negotiations with Austria. It is not likely that these negotiations have been resumed unless both sides think that there is yet a chance of agreement; but if this is the case why the mobilization which goes far beyond the limits of necessary precaution and is, indeed, calculated to defeat the efforts of the diplomatists, however promising they may be? There may, of course, be a satisfactory explanation, but as the matter stands it is inexplicable and is all the more regrettable because it is calculated—we feel sure unjustly—to cast doubts upon the loyalty and straightforwardness of the Russian government.”

Germany declared war and at once invaded Belgium in spite of the fact that she had been one of the signers of the treaty guarding that country's neutrality, and so the horrible contest began and the bravery of the Belgians in defending their country has enlisted the sympathy and aroused the admiration of the world. This is but natural as every man loves the fighter

“Who faces fearful odds

For the ashes of his Fathers and the Temples of his Gods.”

But what of Germany, attacked on all sides without the support of Italy on which she had naturally counted? She stands with all the world against her, fighting for her very existence, and even the nations which are neutral at the present stage of the game are refusing sympathy or understanding.

From the evidence thus far allowed to pass through the censors of his enemies, for we must remember that at the outbreak of hostilities Great Britain cut the German cables, the German Emperor made the one mistake in his already long reign when he allowed his General Staff to order the invasion of Belgium. From the evidence thus far allowed as I have said, this was a horrible mistake, but on the other hand, Germany claims to have had direct knowledge that Belgium had entered into an understanding with England and France as far back as 1906. This fact has been repeatedly denied by the British Government, but Dr. Dernburg has proven its truth in an able document entitled “The Case of Belgium” in which he reproduces photographic fac-similes of the documents in question, which documents Great Britain has called merely “an academic discussion.” In the New Republic for November 28th, 1914, Professor Roland G. Usher, who can not be suspected of being pro-German, contributed a very able article entitled: “Was Belgium neutral?” In this article he says:

“Let us leave this labyrinth where we wander perplexed from treaty to treaty, from White Paper to Grey Paper, from letters of historians to pamphlets by scientists. Let us leave the whole wilderness of justification and look at the facts, not so much for the sake of convincing or convicting anyone as to find



out what the situation was at the time the war broke out. We shall see that in fact no one was really neutral—least of all, Belgium.”

It is not my intention to quote the whole or even the greater part of Mr. Usher’s clear statement of the actual relations between Belgium and France and England, but in summing up these facts which are so plainly in harmony with the “secret documents” made public a month later by Dr. Dernburg, he says:

“Whatever the diplomatic facts may be, whatever the technicalities of alliances and treaties eventually prove to have been, Belgium was as clearly an ally of France as England was. The Belgian army and its dispositions, the Belgian forts on the German frontier were prepared with the advice, at least, of French and English generals. Plans for the co-operation of the three armies were undoubtedly made. Let us not quibble over the question whether this was not an infringement of the neutrality. The Belgians knew—let us say it once more—that the neutrality of Belgium was a fiction because Belgium was not neutral ground.”

I do not attempt, with the information at hand, to even try to excuse the invasion of Belgium, but is it not more wise and more just for the American people to defer any final judgment upon a question of such great importance until all of the evidence on both sides is before the world? Let us but remember the effect upon the public opinion in Europe by the first accounts of Sherman’s march to the sea and how, later, history has proven the necessity of what at that time and for some years after was described as an act of “brutal and uncalled for atrocity.” Both Germany and Great Britain are taking great pains to secure the approbation of the people of the United States for their positions in the war. By far the ablest article setting forth the British standpoint appeared in the October number of Scribners’ Magazine by Sir Henry Norman, M. P. This article is beautifully written and stirs one into an enthusiasm for the disinterestedness and unselfishness of British ideals until one nears the very end, but there one finds the “nigger in the wood pile.” Sir Henry says that Great Britain is fighting for the “peace of the world,” but as a condition of that peace Germany must be humiliated to the point where she will agree to practical disarmament and to pledge herself never to build a navy. Not a word about the British navy or the British assumption that her navy must always be twice as large as that of any other power. Why should Germany, a strong and virile nation of 67,000,000 people, shut up in a territory so small in comparison with our State of Texas that if one cut out of Texas an area equal in size to the whole of the New England States, it would still be larger than the German Empire, be compelled to forever prevent her crowded people from expanding while England shall be allowed to monopolize the commerce of the world? This is a question which vitally affects us. We have but to look back over our own history from the end of the Revolution to the end of the Civil War to see how Great Britain treated both our navy and our Merchant Marine. It is only since we practically ceased to be her competi-

tor on the sea that England has been so wholly our friend. We are now striving to re-establish our Merchant Marine and England has already shown, by her informal protest against our buying foreign ships which the war has put out of service, how she regards such efforts on our part. Is it not more than likely that, should we again become a power on the sea, her present animosity and commercial jealousy against Germany will be turned against us? All of these are questions which the American people should carefully consider before forming any final opinion, but they are far too important to be more than touched upon in an article whose sole purpose is to clear up an uncharitable judgment of a truly great man. I wish to make one more quotation in upholding my point as to the Kaiser's lifelong desire to keep his people at peace with the world. This quotation is from an article in the Atlantic Monthly by no less widely known and admired an authority than Guglielmo Ferrero, the great Italian historian. He says:

"A very intelligent but very skeptical German said to me one day, 'My friend, there is only one pacifist in Germany; it is William II, but he can do nothing because he is the Emperor.'"

"A paradox which contains a certain amount of truth. William II will have to shoulder before this world and in history, the chief responsibility for the war; yet those who know the secrets of political Europe are aware that he has been for twenty-five years perhaps the most active protector of European peace. In 1905 he prevented the war which a strong party around him already wished, when the dispute about Morocco began with France. 'History', said he one day to a French friend of mine on board the Hohenzollern, during the regatta at Kiel, 'history will give me credit for this at least, that Europe has owed its peace to me.'"

"By temperament, by a certain mystical tendency, by the sagacity of a statesman, William II was and wishes to be an Emperor of Peace."

In summing up this analysis of the Kaiser to show how opposed he was to the war, Signor Ferrero closes his argument with these words:

"It is sufficient to say that in the days preceding the declaration of war, newspapers conservative in the extreme, like the 'Kreuzzeitung', published articles almost threatening William II; reminding him that he had not the right to sacrifice his duties as Emperor to his personal hobby of pacifism."

In Anglo-Saxon Democratic countries public opinion is a strange thing and subject to many vagaries. During the late war between Japan and Russia, largely through the influence of the British press, public opinion in this country was strongly in favor of Japan in spite of the fact that Russia had always been most friendly to the United States. After the treaty of Portsmouth the American people began to think about the war and the international questions to which it had given birth and almost immediately a strong reaction set in. We consider rightly that, with the single exception of Washington, our greatest patriot, statesman, and man was Abraham Lincoln and yet

during our Civil War he was regarded throughout the British dominions as a fiend let loose. Mr. Henry Adams, the historian and scholar, lineally descended from two presidents of the United States, in his book entitled, "The Education of Henry Adams", says:

"No that London was altogether beside itself on one point, in especial it created a nightmare of its own and gave it the shape of Abraham Lincoln. Behind this it placed another demon, if possible more devilish, and called it Mr. Seward. In regard to these two men English society seemed demented. Defense was useless. Explanation was in vain. One could only let the passion exhaust itself. One's best friends were as unreasonable as enemies, for the belief in poor Mr. Lincoln's brutality and Seward's ferocity became a dogma of popular faith."

Change the scene to America, and for the names of Lincoln and Seward, substitute those of the Kaiser and von-Bethmann-Hollweg, and this quotation fitly applies to the general tone of the American Press today and yet Dean Burgess of Columbia, who perhaps more than any other American has had opportunities to study the Kaiser in intimate contact, has said:

"With all this experience, with all this opportunity for observation at close range, I am hardly able to recognize a single characteristic usually attributed to the Kaiser by the British and American press of today.

"He always appeared to me most deeply concerned with the arts of peace. I have never heard him speak much of war and then always with abhorrence, nor much of military matters, but improved agriculture, invention, and manufacture, and especially commerce and education in all their ramifications were the chief objects of his thought and conversation."

Mr. Carnegie, who has had many opportunities to know and talk with the German Emperor has said, since his recent return from Europe, that the Kaiser is only to be pitied and not blamed for the war. He speaks of him today as the "saddest man in Europe", the man who throughout his life has striven whole-heartedly to preserve peace and build up the internal prosperity and happiness of the people for whose welfare he holds himself responsible to Almighty God. Should not we Americans, the recognized champions of fair play and square deal, pay some heed to the words of our citizen who, in this case, can speak with authority, and should we not look back over the list of his splendid achievements for civilization and humanity, some of which I have attempted to set forth, before we undertake to criticize or condemn the German Kaiser?

"By their works ye shall know them," our Master said, and we may be sure that in the final judgment for which we all must wait, it is by works which he has done for the benefit of his people and not by this terrible war into which he has been forced that the German Emperor will be judged.



3 0112 062189045